

**REMARKS**

This Amendment is response to the Office Action mailed May 2, 2000.

The examiner objects to the title on the grounds that it is not descriptive. In response the title is amended to read "Pattern Matching in Communications Network".

Claims 1-8, 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Dea et al. US Patent No. 5,742,833. To support the rejection the examiner argues, in part, that Dea shows a storage for storing a set of patterns...

In response to this rejection applicants respectfully disagree with the examiner's characterization that Dea shows a storage for storing a set of patterns. Contrary to the examiner's position Dea does show a storage but no pattern is stored in the storage. Applicants direct the attention of the examiner to column 5, lines 18-24, which states, in part,

"As is common in such data processing systems, each individual computer may be coupled to a storage device 14 and/or a printer/output device 16. One or more such storage devices 14 may be utilized in accordance with the method of the present invention to store objects such as documents, resource objects or executable code which may be periodically accessed by any user within data processing system 8".

This teaching clearly suggests that Dea does not store patterns as the examiner argued.

In addition, applicants argue that Dea does not show or teach a storage that stores mask data identifying patterns to be matched in the storage which stores the patterns. As a consequence applicants argue that applicants' claims are clearly patentable over Dea since Dea does not teach the first storage which stores the patterns and/or the second storage that stores data to indicate which pattern to use. In view of this difference applicants argue that claims 1-8 and 12-14 are clearly patentable over the art of record. Even though the claim as originally written clearly points out this distinction in an attempt to promote the prosecution of this case, the claims are amended to state in a more positive way the elements which distinguish over the art of record.

Moreover, claims 4-7 are patentable in their own right in that they claim specific orientation of the mask in the mask register and the patterns in the pattern register. No such layout is set forth in the reference. Therefore claims 4-7 are patentable in their own right over the art of record.

Claims 4 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dea et al. US Patent No. 5,742,833. The examiner's argument in support of the rejection is set forth on page 7 of the office action. For brevity it is not repeated here but can be reviewed if need be.

In response to this rejection applicants respectfully disagree with the examiner's position. Applicants' claims 4 and 9 provide a specific way in which to lay out information in the pattern RAM and how to select address in the pattern RAM to make specific pattern be available for matching. The Dea reference relates to the technique of comparing the address of the station with an address received from the network. In this simple method of comparison there will be no need to arrange the single ID number

of a station in a pattern RAM as set forth in claim 4. As a consequence the Dea reference teaches away from applicants' invention and an artisan viewing the teachings in Dea would not derive claims 4 and 9 as the examiner suggested.

In addition, applicants argue that by positioning the pattern in the pattern RAM as suggested in claim 4 and selecting the address as is set forth in claim 9 applicants makes it much easier for a user to select one of the plurality of patterns in the pattern RAM. The examiner admits that the structure in claims 4 and 9 is different from Dea's reference. Applicants argue that the difference in structure and the benefit which the claims provide are clear evidence of unobviousness. In view of the above argument, claims 4 and 9 are patentable over Dea et al.

Claims 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dea et al., US Patent No. 5,742,833 as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Jeng US Patent No. 5,892,768. The examiner's argument in support of the rejection are set forth on page 8 of the office action. For brevity it is not repeated here but can be reviewed if the need arises.

In response to the rejection applicants argue that the arguments set forth above relative to claim 1 are equally applicable to the rejection of claims 10 and 11 and are incorporated herein by reference.

Regarding Jeng, US Patent No. 5,892,768, applicants argue that this reference is cumulative in that it does not support the deficiencies which applicants point out relative to the Dea reference. Therefore, by including a reference such as Jeng which does not support the shortcomings of the main reference Dea, it is applicants' position

that the examiner's combination falls short of providing any teaching that would lead an artisan to form a combination that would invalidate claims 10 and 11.

Furthermore, applicants argue that the examiner's combination of Dea et al. and Jeng is improper in that there is no basis or motivation in the reference for forming the combination. Since the respective references lack any basis or motivation, applicants argue that the examiner has failed to make out a *prima facie* case of obviousness and claims 10 and 11 are clearly patentable over the art of record.

In view of the above it is believed that applicants have answered all the issues raised by the examiner. Reconsideration is respectfully requested and an early allowance of all the claims is solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,



Joscelyn G. Cockburn, Reg. No. 27,069  
Attorney of Record

JGC:ko  
919-543-9036  
FAX 919-543-3634